7

THE STATE OF THE REPRESENTATION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,

DELIVERED TO THE SOCIETY,

THE

FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE,

ASSOIATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING A

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM,

On SATURDAY the 9th of FEBUARY 1793. by their Committee appointed for that purpoſe.

REVISED, COMPRESSED, AND REPRINTED BY THE

LONDON CORRESPONDING, AND REFORMING SOCIETIES,

14th MAY 1795.

LONDON:

Sold by J. SMITH, No. 1, Portſmouth-ſtreet, Lincoln's Inn-Fields: POTTS, Newington-Butts; SPENCE, Little Turnſtile, Holborn; EATON, Newgate Street; RIEBEAU, No. 439, Strand; BALLARD, Bedford Court, Covent Garden; BURKS, Criſpin Street, Spital Fields; JOYCE and TOONE, King Street, Bloomſbury; LEE, Haymarket; And R. PHILLIPS, Leiceſter.

MDCCXCV.

THE

REPRESENTATION

OF

ENGLAND AND WALES.

YOUR COMMITTEE apprehend that they cannot better comply with the intentions of your Society, than by arranging the ſubject referred to them under diſtinct Heads, and giving a plain ſtatement of facts unmixed with any argumentative inference, and accompanied by no other obſervations than ſuch as a due attention to perſpicuity may appear to render neceſſary.

To this line of proceeding your Committee feel more particularly attached, becauſe it carries with it that internal evidence of openneſs and fair dealing which muſt conciliate the unprejudiced, even if it were poſſible it ſhould fail to convince them, and confines the opponents of reform to that iſſue which ſets at defiance all ſpeculation and ſophiſtry, and on which every man is capable of forming a judgment. An unembelliſhed detail of facts muſt, to be refuted, be invalidated; and for the ſame reaſon that it is impregnable if well founded, it is eaſily ſhaken if built on falſhood or error. By the very plan of their Report, therefore, your Committee give an unequivocal teſtimony that they reſt their claim to credit ſolely upon the accuracy of their ſtatements; and they offer a ſubſtantial proof that they fear no inveſtigation into what they advance, by the manner in which they advance it.

Of the Repreſentation, as it exiſts in point of Form.

YOUR Committee find that the number of repreſentatives is 513 (excluſive of Scotland), and that they are returned to ſerve in Parliament by the different counties in the following proportions to the groſs number:—

40 Counties return 2 each,	—	—	80
12 Counties (Wales) 1 each,	—	—	12
			— 92

Theſe Counties which are claſſed according to the uſual diviſion of England, return Members for the different Cities, Towns, and Boroughs they contain, in the following proportions. viz.

Carry over — 92

Northier

Northern Counties.

			Brought forward	92
Northumberland, including Berwick,	—	—	—	6
Cumberland,	—	—	—	4
Weſtmoreland,	—	—	—	2
Durham,	—	—	—	2
Yorkſhire,	—	—	—	28
Lancaſhire,	—	—	—	12
Northern Counties return, excluſive of County Members,				54

Middle Counties Weſtward.

Cheſhire,	—	—	—	2
Derbyſhire,	—	—	—	2
Staffordſhire,	—	—	—	8
Warwickſhire,	—	—	—	4
Worceſterſhire,	—	—	—	7
Shropſhire,	—	—	—	10
Herfordſhire,	—	—	—	6
Monmouthſhire,	—	—	—	1
Glouceſterſhire,	—	—	—	6
Middle Counties Weſtward return, excluſive of County Members				46

Middle Counties Eaſtward.

Oxfordſhire,	—	—	—	5
Buckinghamſhire,	—	—	—	12
Bedfordſhire,	—	—	—	2
Northamptonſhire,	—	—	—	7
Nottinghamſhire,	—	—	—	6
Rutland,	—	—	—	0
Leiceſterſhire,	—	—	—	2
Lincolnſhire,	—	—	—	10
Huntingdonſhire,	—	—	—	2
Middle Counties Weſtward return, excluſive of County Members				46

Eaſtern Counties.

Norfolk,	—	—	—	10
Suffolk,	—	—	—	14
Cambridgeſhire,	—	—	—	2
Hertfordſhire,	—	—	—	4
Middleſex,	—	—	—	6
Eſſex,	—	—	—	6
Eaſtern Counties return, excluſive of County Members,				42

Weſtern Counties.

Dorſetſhire,	—	—	—	18
Somerſetſhire,	—	—	—	16
Devonſhire,	—	—	—	24
Cornwall,	—	—	—	42
Weſtern Counties return, excluſive of County Members,				100
			Carry over	380

Southern

Southern Counties.

			Brought forward	380
Kent,	—	—	—	8
Suſſex,	—	—	—	18
Surrey,	—	—	—	12
Hampſhire,	—	—	—	24
Berſhire,	—	—	—	7
Weltſhire,	—	—	—	32
Cinque Ports,	—	—	—	16
Southern Counties and *Cinque Ports* return, excluſive of County Members,	—	—	—	117
12 *Counties* of *Wales* return 1 each, excluſive of County Members,	—	—		12
2 *Univerſities*, 2 each,	—	—		4
			Total	513

YOUR Committee, having thus ſhewn the proportions in which the different counties and diviſions of England are repreſented, will next endeavour to point out *in what proportions the elective franchiſe is diſtributed among the body of electors.*

Your Committee, have found it impracticable to obtain any accurate account of the total number of electors in England, but they conceive that the neceſſity for ſuch an account is eſſentially obviated by the one which they are enabled to lay before you. The following ſtatement, on the general correctneſs of which they can rely, is concluſive to prove, that, by the partial and unequal manner in which the maſs of electors is divided, ſuch a proportion of the 513 repreſentatives is returned to Parliament by a few, as renders it of little conſequence by how many the remainder is elected. If 3 perſons be choſen by 30, and 2 by 4970, though undoubtedly the 5 are choſen by 5000 ſtill it will hardly be contended that ſuch a diſtribution of the electors does not effectually take away every advantage of popular repreſentation.

Your Committee find that *two hundred and fifty-ſeven Members*, being a *majority* of the Commons of England, are elected by 11,075 *voters*; or in other words by little more than the 170th *part* of the People to be repreſented, even ſuppoſing them to be only *two millions*.

The operation of this defect in the repreſentation cannot however be thoroughly underſtood, without obſerving the manner in which the body who return this majority is *ſub-divided*; for this purpoſe your Committee have drawn out the following ſtatement, in order to bring before you in detail, the number of electors by which each of the different Repreſentatives, who conſtitute a majority of the Houſe of Commons, is choſen; and, with a view to ſhew all that the repreſentation even pretends to be, your Committee have conſidered *Burgage* tenures, and other rights of a ſimilar deſcription, as creating *real* voters; the actual number of which they have taken into their calculation, reckoning them as electors having individually a free choice.

A STATEMENT

A STATEMENT

OF

The Proportions, in which the Elective Franchiſe is diſtributed among that Body of Electors who return the Majority of the 513 Members for England and Wales.

Places where the right of Voting is in Burgage and other Tenures of a ſimilar Deſcription.

	Number of Voters	Members
Appleby	220	2
Aſhburton	200	2
Great Bedwin	80	2
Beeralſton	100	2
Blechingly	90	2
Boroughbridge	74	2
Bramber	36	2
Clitheroe	102	2
Cockermouth	260	2
Downton	20	2
E. Grinſtead	36	2
Heyteſbury	50	2
Horſham	60	2
Knareſborough	110	2
Malton	200	2
Midhurſt	100	2
Northallerton	200	2
Petersfield	154	2
Richmond	270	2
Rippon	186	2
Ryegate	200	2
Saltaſh	38	2
Old Sarum	7	2
Thirſke	50	2
Weobſy	45	2
Weſtbury	50	2
Electors	2938	retn. 52

Places where the Number of Voters does not exceed 50,

Alborough (Suffolk)	35	2
Andover	15	2
Banbury	19	1
Bath	32	2
Beamaris	24	2
Bewdley	14	1
Biſhop's Caſtle	50	2
Bodmyn	36	2
Boſſiney	20	2
Brackley	33	2
Buckingham	13	2
Calne	34	2
Camelford	19	2
Caſtle Riſing	50	2
Chriſtchurch	40	2
Corff Caſtle	20	2
Devizes	30	2
Droitwich	14	2
Dunwich	40	2
Eaſt Looe	20	2
Edmondſbury	36	2
Gatton	10	2
St. Germains	20	2
Grampound	50	2
Harwich	31	2
Helſton	36	2
Haſtings	12	2
Launceſton	20	2
Liſkeard	50	2
Leſtwithiel	24	2
Lyme Regis	31	2
Lymington	18	2
Malmeſbury	13	2
Marlborough	7	2
St. Mawes	36	2
St. Michael	42	2
Newport (Hants)	24	2
Newtown (Lancaſhire)	50	2
Newtown (Hants)	36	2
Orford	20	2
Romney	13	2
Rye	15	2
Scarborough	44	2
Taviſtock	50	2
Thetford	31	2
Tiverton	26	2

Truro

	Number of Voters	Members
Truro	26	2
Wilton	58	2
Winchelſea	9	2
Wycombe	48	2
Yarmouth (Hants)	13	2
Electors	1449 retn.	100

Places where the Number of Voters does not exceed 100.

Agmondeſham	70	2
Aldborough (Yorkſhire)	57	2
Callington	62	2
Dartmouth	98	2
Weſt Looe	70	2
Fowey	63	2
Great Grimſby	75	2
Haſlemere	60	2
Higham Ferrers	84	2
Hythe	96	2
Montgomery	80	1
Newport (Cornwall)	62	2
Oakhampton	96	2
Poole	100	2
Portſmouth	60	2
Saliſbury	54	2
Seaford	82	2
Steyning	100	2
Stockbridge	102	2
Totneſs	80	2
Tregony	60	2
Wenlock	100	2
Whitchurch	70	2
Electors	1781 retun.	45

Places where the Number of Voters does not exceed 200.

Arundel	190	2
Boſton	200	2
Bridport	180	2
Chippenham	140	2
Cambridge	200	2
Dorcheſter	200	2
Eye	200	2
Guildford	120	2
Heydon	190	2
Hindon	200	2
Huntingdon	200	2
Ilcheſter	150	2
St. Ives	180	2
Ludgerſhall	110	2
Minehead	160	2
Milbourne Port	114	2
Morpeth	200	2
Penryn	140	2
Plymouth	160	2
Plympton	104	2
Queenſborough	131	2
Retford	112	2
Wallingford	140	2
Wareham	150	2
Wendover	120	2
Woodſtock	200	2
Wootten Baſſet	160	2
Wincheſter	110	2
Electors	4461 retn.	56

Places where the Number of Voters does not exceed 300.

Marlow	216	2
Bridgewater	230	2
	446	4

ABSTRACT.

2,938	elect	52
1,449	—	100
1,781	—	45
4,461	—	56
446	—	4
11,075		return 257

Note. The general accuracy of this ſtatement your Committee are ſatisfied may be relied upon. They do not pretend to ſtate that the number of voters in every ſeparate borough is exactly aſcertained, but they are perſuaded that they are rightly *claſſed*; that is, that thoſe places ſet down in the ſecond claſs have not more than 50; in the third claſs not more than 100; and ſo of the reſt. The difficulty of giving the exact number will at once appear, when it is recollected that in moſt of the boroughs here mentioned, there have been no conteſts for many years. Your Committee have, however, procured the beſt intelligence in their power.

YOUR COMMITTEE will now call your attention to *the various rights of voting* which are exerciſed in the different places returning members to Parliament.

They find that the members for the 52 counties are all elected by one uniform right. Every man throughout England, poſſeſſed of 40 ſhillings per annum freehold, except in certain cities and towns having peculiar juriſdictions, is entitled to a vote for the county in which ſuch freehold is ſituated.

With reſpect to the different cities, towns, and boroughs, they exerciſe a variety of ſeparate and diſtinct rights, ſcarcely capable of being claſſed in any methodical order, and ſtill leſs of being aſcertained by the application of any fixed principle. In the greater part of them indeed the right of voting appears to be veſted in the *freemen of bodies corporate*, but, under this general deſcription, an infinite diverſity of peculiar cuſtoms is to be found In ſome places the number of voters is limited to a ſelect body not exceeding 30 or 40; in others it is extended to 8, or 10,000. In ſome places the freeman muſt be a reſident inhabitant to entitle him to vote; in others his preſence is only required at an election. The right to the freedom is alſo different in different boroughs, and may, according to the peculiar uſage, he obtained by birth, ſervitude, marriage, redemption, &c. &c.

The remaining rights of voting are of a ſtill more complicated deſcription. Burgageholds, leaſeholds, and freeholds,—ſcot and lot, inhabitants houſeholders, inhabitants a large, potwallopers, and commonalty, each in different Boroughs prevail, and create endleſs miſunderſtandings and litigation, from the difficulty which is daily found to ariſe in defining and ſettling the legal import of thoſe numerous diſtictions, which, in ſome places, commit the choice of two members to as many inhabitants as every houſe can contain; in others, to the poſſeſſor of a ſpot of ground where neither houſes nor inhabitants have been ſeen for years, and which, in a few inſtances, have even prevented the wiſdom of Parliament from finally determining who are entitled to vote, or what the right is*.

Your Committee have not entered into any detail of the different rights of voting, becauſe it would have extended their report to a very tedious, and, in their opinion, a very unneceſſary length; they cannot however paſs over this part of their enquiry without calling your

* Pomfret, Poole, Weſtminſter, Ludgerſhall, Newark, and Carliſle, have appeals upon the right of voting before the Houſe of Commons remaining yet undecided.

A great variety of caſes might be quoted to ſhew the inconvenience ariſing from the preſent complicated rights of voting; that of Saltaſh in particular is too curious to be unnoticed. Since the year 1772, it has occupied the attention of no leſs than five Committees, and is ſtill open to diſpute. In 1793, the right was determined to be in the corporation, and the candidates returned by them were declared to be duly elected. One of theſe gentlemen having vacated his ſeat, a new election brought the queſtion again before the Houſe, when the right was determined to be in the burgage holders, and the ſeat given accordingly. By theſe contradictory deciſions two gentlemen voted in Parliament for three years, each of them denying the pretentions of the other, and the Houſe of Commons having at different times decided againſt the right of both.

For a competent knowledge of the various rights of voting, ſee the Reports of Meſſrs Douglas, Luders, Phillips, and Frazer, where, in nine volumes, much light is thrown upon the ſubject.

attention

attention to the following facts, conceiving that the manner in which the voice of the people is at preſent collected, cannot be placed in a ſtronger point of view by ſtating thoſe who *are*, than by deſcribed ſome of thoſe who *are not* entitled to vote.

A man poſſeſſed of 1000l. *per annum, or any greater ſum, ariſing from copyhold, leaſehold for* 99 *years, trade, property in the national funds, or even freehold in the city of London, and many other cities and towns having peculiar juriſdictions*‡, *is not thereby entitled to vote.*

Religious opinions create an incapacity to exerciſe the Elective Franchiſe. All *Catholics* are excluded generally, and by the operation of the Teſt Laws, *Proteſtant Diſſenters* are deprived of a voice in the election of Repreſentatives in about thirty boroughs, where the right of voting is confined to the corporate officers alone.

A man paying taxes to any amount, how great ſoever, for his domeſtic eſtabliſhment, does not obtain a right to vote unleſs his reſidence be in ſome borough where that right is veſted in the inhabitants. To aſcertain how far this exception applies, your Committe have carefully examined into the number of boroughs in which the elective franchiſe is committed to the inhabitants, and they find them to be 60, of which 28 contain leſs than 300 voters. Your Committee muſt here add, that it appears by a return made to Parliament, from the the Tax-office, in 1785, that the number of houſes paying taxes was 714,911.

SUCH appears to be the nature of the principal qualifications, and reſtrictions under which the right of voting is beſtowed or withheld; it next remains to be ſhewn *who may legally be choſen as the repreſentative.*

Your Committee find a variety of diſabilities created by different ſtatutes, or the cuſtom of Parliament. By theſe, minors, papiſts, aliens, clergymen in prieſt's orders, ſheriffs, and other returning officers in their reſpective juriſdictions, perſons concerned in the management of certain duties, or poſſeſſing certain offices, contractors, and perſons holding penſions during pleaſure, are incapacitated to ſit in the Houſe of Commons. Beſide theſe diſqualifications, there is alſo another moſt material one, by which the Electors are precluded from making choice of any man not poſſeſſed of property *in land.* By the 9th. Anne, c. 5. every Candidate, if required, muſt take an oath that he has a clear eſtate of freehold or † copyhold, to the value of 600l. per annum in the caſe of the Knight of a Shire, and 300l. in the caſe of a Citizen or Burgeſs; and the oath muſt be renewed when the member takes his ſeat. The only exception is in favour of the repreſentatives of the two Univerſities, and the eldeſt ſons or heirs apparent of peers. and perſons poſſeſſing 600l. per ann. from whom no qualification is required.

WITH reſpect to *the duration of Parliaments*, your Committee find, that by an act paſſed in the year 1694, (or ſoon after the Revolution),

‡ At Kingſton upon Hull, for inſtance, the number of freeholders, thus excluded, is ſtated to amount to 500.

† A Copyhold qualifies to repreſent, but not to elect.

it was declared, that, "*By the ancient laws and ſtatutes of this kingdom, frequent parliaments ought to be held, and that frequent and new Parliaments tend very much to the happy union and good agreement of the King and People.*" and therefore it was enacted, "*that no parliament ſhould laſt longer than for three years.*"

In the firſt year of the reign of Geo. I. (or 1715) the Parliament, which was thus elected for *three* years, determined that it would be more convenient to hold their ſeats for *ſeven*, and by a law at that time paſſed, and ſtill unrepealed, ſuch at preſent is the legal term, before the expiration of which the people cannot revoke their truſt, be the conduct of their repreſentatives what it may. The royal prerogative gives however to the King a better ſecurity for the good behavour of the Commons toward the Crown, by enabling him to diſſolve the Parliament at any hour which to his Miniſters ſhall ſeem proper.

Of the Mode of Conducting Elections.

YOUR COMMITTEE having reported upon various heads which the firſt diviſion of their enquiry preſented to them, and having, in ſo doing, laid before you what may be called the conſtituent parts of an election, (namely, the places entitled to ſend repreſentatives, who are qualified to chooſe, and who to be choſen) come next to examine in what manner thoſe different rights are brought into action, and to ſtate to you, *the mode in which Elections are conducted.*

Your Committee find that election proceedings are carried on with extreme inconvenience to the electors, and exceſſive expence to the candidates. The two evils are however ſo intimately blended, and depend ſo much upon each other, that from an idea that a ſeparate and diſtinct diſcuſion of them would only lead to tireſome repetition, and unneceſſary detail, it has been thought moſt adviſeable, to conſider them both under one head.

The firſt defect in the ſyſtem eſtabliſhed for collecting the opinions of the People, to which your Committee will requeſt your attention, is, that the *Poll*, whether the voters conſiſt of 10, or 10,000, and whether the right of voting be in inhabitants reſident, or in freemen, or freeholders diſperſed throughout the county, is *only taken in one fixed place**. A freeholder of *Cornwall*, living in *Northumberland*, muſt forego the exerciſe of his franchiſe, or travel to *Leſtwithiel*; and a freeman of *Berwick* reſiding at *Falmouth*, can only be heard as an Elector after a journey of 400 miles.

As theſe may be called extreme caſes, and your Committee are above all things anxious to confine themſelves within the limits of ſtrict fact and practice, they conceive it neceſſary to enter into ſome detail on this ſubject.

In county elections it frequently happens that the freeholder, living in the county itſelf, muſt go 40, 50, or 60 miles before he can be admitted to poll; but theſe are trifling journies compared to what muſt be

* Except in Hampſhire, where, for "the eaſe of the inhabitants," the ſheriff has a power of removing the Poll to the Iſle of Wight. 7 & 8 W. 3 c. 25 ſ. 10.

taken by thoſe who, being freemen of one city or town, reſide in another. Your Committee have thought they could not furniſh better information reſpecting this inconvenience, than by conſulting and making extracts from a certain number of thoſe poll books, which are printed at different Boroughs by authority of the returning officer, and which diſtinguiſh the number of *reſident* from *non-reſident* freemen. From theſe it appears that, at the following places, the proportion at the laſt conteſts ſtood thus:

	Reſidents	From London	From the Conntry	Total
Canterbury -	832	153	354	1339
Coventry -	1891	356	278	2525
Bedford -	919	187	332	1438
Lincoln -	428	126	406	960
Newcaſtle (Northumberland)	1148	208	889	2245
Briſtol -	3957	663	1429	6049
Colcheſter -	528	227	525	1280
Lancaſter -	657	144	1481	2182

From the above, which are ſelected from a great varitey of ſimilar inſtances, to give a general idea of the ſubject, it appears, that in many places the non reſident are nearly equal to the reſident voters, and in ſome places actually out number them.

Your Committee have not thought it neceſſary to ſtate more than two claſſes of non-reſidents, viz, thoſe *from London*, and thoſe *from the country* generally. The variety of diſtances from which the latter are brought, would, if here ſet down, extend this Report to too great length, but the curious may eaſily ſatisfy themſelves by a reference to the printed poll-books. Your Committee conceive they give an avarage ſufficiently correct, when they take the diſtance which the country voters have, one with another, to travel, to be, for each place, *a fourth part* of the diſtance which ſuch place is from London. Thus the non reſident country voters for Briſtol, it is to be aſſumed reſide 30 miles from the place of poll, thoſe living in London not being nearer than 120 miles.

On enquiry among thoſe agents who have been in the habit of managing the conveyance of voters from one place to another, ſuch accounts have been received of the extravagant expence attending this part of an election as would, if here ſet down, ſubject your Committee to the imputation of having exaggerated in their ſtatement. For inſtance, every voter at *Newcaſtle upon Tyne*, coming from London, is ſaid to coſt 30l.; at *Exeter* 20l.; at *Briſtol* 15l.: at *Colcheſter* 10l. The reaſons aſſigned for ſuch exorbitant charges are, that the greater part of the freemen are tradeſmen, or mechanics, who cannot be ſuppoſed to travel great diſtances, merely for the ſake of giving a vote; that they are to be enticed from home, if not by direct bribery, at leaſt by the inducement of pleaſant conveyance, good accommodations, and reaſonable ſatisfaction, if not ſome thing more, for their trouble and loſs of time; and that, when a candidate undertakes to pay the travelling expences of a man who is to confer a favour upon him at the end of the

journey,

journey, it cannot be expected that he will venture to ſcrutinize too cloſely into the expedition with which he proceeds, or the length of the bills he incurs on the road.

What effect this reaſoning may have on the minds of thoſe who are not converſant in Elections, your Committee know not; but the accuracy of the following *Eſtimate*, which, for the better underſtanding the extent of the expence in queſtion, they have thought it proper to lay before you, will not, they perſuade themſelves, be controverted, except for the purpoſe of adding to the amount.

Eſtimate of the leaſt Expence of conveying a Voter from the Place of his Reſidence to the Place of the Poll.

Sixpence per mile—coſt of conveyance.
Seven ſhillings and Sixpence per day—coſt of maintenance.
Ten ſhillings and Sixpence per day—for loſs of time and trouble.

This † laſt charge is calculated from the ſum which, on an average, is paid on the ſame account to witneſſes from the country attending Election Committees in the Houſe of Commons.

According to this eſtimate it appears, that

A voter taken 50 *miles to poll, will coſt,*

	£	s	d
For conveyance out and home -	2	10	0
For three days maintenance -	1	2	6
For three days loſs of time and trouble	1	11	6
£	5	4	0

A voter taken 250 *miles to poll, will coſt.*

	£	s	d
For conveyance out and home :	12	10	0
For ſeven days maintenance .	2	12	6
For ſeven days loſs of time and trouble .	3	13	6
£	18	16	0

In the above, your Committee has ſuppoſed that the voter ſpends only *one clear day* at the place of election; but they muſt obſerve, that, from every information they have been able to collect, his ſtay there is generally much longer.

With reſpect to the expedition with which the voter travels, it is impoſſible to lay down any fixed rule as to the number of miles to be travelled in one day; but your Committee apprehend, they may be fairly ſtated to be from 50 to 90, according to the diſtance of the entire journey. A voter, for inſtance, would be a day in going from London to Canterbury (56 miles) and probably not more in going to

† It is true, that in the ſtrictneſs of the law, the voter is not entitled to be paid for his loſs of time and trouble, but the practice of doing it has become ſo general, and the propriety of it ſo univerſally aſſented to, that it is now notoriouſly inſiſted upon by all voters, and neceſſarily complied with by all candidates.

Coventry

Coventry (91 miles); and in ſuch journeys as from London to Newcaſtle (273 miles) he might continue to travel at the rate of 80 or 90.

If any credit be given to the accuracy of theſe eſtimates, it will be eaſy, with the aſſiſtance of the preceding extracts from the printed poll books, to form an idea what the expence of bringing non-reſident voters to poll muſt be in places where the electors are numerous.—Thus,

At Colcheſter.—The voters reſident in London, being 227 to be brought 50 miles to poll, muſt, if abſent 3 days, coſt at leaſt 5*l.* 4*s.* each, or altogether, - £. 1180

At Coventry.—The voters reſident in London, being 356, to be brought 90 miles, ſuppoſing them only to be out 3 days, coſt 7*l.* 4*s*, each, or altogether, - £ 2563

At Newcaſtle upon Tyne—The voters reſident in London, being 208, to be brought 274 miles, muſt, ſuppoſing them to be abſent from home 7 days, coſt at leaſt 20*l.* each, or altogether, - - - £ 4160

At Briſtol.—The voters reſident in London being 663, to be brought 120 miles, even ſuppoſing them only to be out 4 days, muſt coſt at leaſt 9*l*, 12*s*. each, or altogether, £ 6364

The non-reſident voters coming from the different parts of the country, your Committee have before propoſed to conſider as travelling one quarter of the diſtance which the place of election is from London; but as it would be difficult to lay down any fixed rule by which to eſtimate the length of time the country voters are abſent from home, they will leave every perſon to form his own calculation on this branch of expence. The truth is, that where the diſtance is under 25 miles, ſome voters will go and return in one day, whereas others, where the diſtance is above 10 miles, will make their polling a buſineſs of two days. Much depends on the voter's character and occupation. If, however, the country voters belonging to Briſtol were to be eſtimated as coſting only 2l. 8s each (that is reckoning them to be abſent only one day,) they would altogether be a charge upon the candidates of 3,429 l.; which, added to the expence of London voters, would make *the total amount to be defrayed, for non reſident electors* 9,793l.

This evil of the voters reſiding at a place diſtant from the poll has alſo another effect, namely the rendering nugatory an act paſſed *to prevent giving meat and liquor at elections*. Cuſtom has ſanctioned the propriety of opening public houſes for the reception of voters from the country, and it may eaſily be conceived how impoſſible it muſt be, during the tumult of an election, to diſtinguiſh one deſcription of electors from another; the conſequence is, that the reſident freemen are equally with the non-reſidents admitted to participate in the diſtribution of liquor, and that the whole town is a ſcene of drunkenneſs and confuſion, to the great inconvenience of the inhabitants, and the intolerable expence of the candidates.

Your

Your Committee know not in what way they can bring before you any exact detail of the various other expences to which candidates are liable. A heavy charge is incurred from the fees payable on the admiſſion of freemen having an inchoate right; that is, a right acquired, but not claimed, and which, as it is to be exerciſed for the benefit of the candidate, is ſo generally taken up at his expence, that from cuſtom it is never conſidered as an act of bribery. Theſe fees vary much, and amount from five ſhillings to five guineas for each admiſſion. The numerous points of law which ariſe in the courſe of every conteſt make it neceſſary for the parties to have the aſſiſtance of counſel, and ſolicitors; the manœuvres which attend all polls, conducted upon a ſyſtem of ſuch intricacy as they are at this day, require the exertions of many vigilant agents; the very cockades form an indiſpenſable and heavy coſt in an election: nor can any candidate, ſpeaking generally, flatter himſelf with much hope of ſucceſs, unleſs his liberality and contempt of œconomy keep equal pace with the extravagance of his competitor.

The extreme length to which Polls are protracted,

It has been ſhewn that be the number of voters what it may, the poll is to be taken in one fixed place;—it is now to be ſeen how long that place is liable to be expoſed to the dreadful tumult, diſorders, and outrages which are but too well known to attend election conteſts.

By an act paſſed in the 25th *Geo.* 3: *c.* 84. (1785) for "the better "regulation of polls and ſcrutinies," the continuance of polls is authorized to laſt during *fifteen days.*

Of the reaſons which induced the legiſlature to acknowledge the propriety of ſo very tedious a proceeding, your Commitee can give no account, but they will endeavour to explain the nature of the methods practiced to fill up the number of days thus liberally allowed. They muſt not however, here omit to remark, that by the 11th *Geo.* 1. *c.* 18. (unrepealed by the ſtatute above quoted) the poll for *the city of London* muſt be cloſed within *ſeven* days from its commencement; a limitation the more extraordinary, asthe voters in the city of London amount to a number not exceeded by any place in England, except Weſtminſter.

If a candidate wiſh to procraſtinate, he has ſeveral ways to open to him by which he may protract the poll to the utmoſt extent of its legal limits.

He may direct his friends to vote one by one as ſlowly as poſſible. By a cuſtom, which from practice has obtained the force of a law, a poll cannot be cloſed unleſs no vote be tendered within a reaſonable time after the returning officer has made three proclamations. By having a vote therefore ready to tender after every ſecond proclamation, a candidate may continue to protract the buſineſs of the poll to ſuch a length as may tend to the infinite vexation and expence of his antagoniſt.

But ſhould it happen that he, whoſe intereſt it is to delay, has not friends enough to *feed the poll,* (as it is called) in the above manner, the law provides him with another mode of carrying his point. He may require

require all the *oaths* to be actually adminiſtered which certain ſtatutes authorize him to inſiſt upon. Theſe are in number no leſs than ſix, viz. the oath of *Allegiance*, the oath of *Supremacy*, the *Bribery Oath*, the oath of *Reſidence*, the *Declarationof Teſt*, and the oath of *Abjuration*. The act of giving a ſingle vote may thus be converted into a tedious and troubleſome operation,

Should neither of the beforementioned expedients be thought ſufficient, there ſtill remains a never-failing ſource of pracraſtination in the complicated and ill-aſcertained qualifications and diſqualifications of electors. Dull indeed muſt be the council who attend an election, if in the way of objection or reply they cannot contrive to lengthen the proceedings to the utmoſt extent of their client's wiſhes.

YOUR COMMITTEE come now to ſpeak of *the power entruſted to the returning officer*, and which, in fact, in all corporate towns, is the power of the ſelect body who chooſe him.

Of the various means of influence and corruption thrown into the hands of theſe ſelect bodies by the preſent ſyſtem of elections, your Committee could ſpeak largely did they not fear the detail would be too extenſive for the limits of their report. They therefore make no comments upon the number of civic honours, and employments, with which theſe formidable bodies can tempt the ambition, or the intereſts of the opulent; they forbear to obſerve upon the controul they obtain over the lower claſs of people, by the terrors of their magiſterial authority; they ſay nothing of the influence derived from the power of granting or refuſing licenſes, from the diſcretion with which they are frequently inveſted in the diſtribution of public charities, or the weight they poſſeſs from the appointment of pariſh officers, and the ſuperintendance of poor rates, and parochial aſſeſſments;—your Committee in this place will only call your attention to the power they enjoy through the medium of *the returning officer*.

The returning officer is veſted with the entire and uncontrouled ſuperintendance of whatever relates to the conduct of an Election. He is entruſted with abſolute authority from the hour of his receiving the precept. to the hour in which he makes his return; for the law repoſes the moſt unbounded confidence in his wiſdom and his honeſty, as will be ſeen by the following ſtatement of the various diſcretionary powers committed to him.

When he receives the precept from the ſheriff, he is to make proclamation of the day of election; and *this he may*, without aſſigning any reaſon for ſo doing, *bring on either on the 5th, 6th, 7th, or 8th day*, as to him may ſeem good to enlarge or curtail the notice. A variety of caſes may readily be conceived in which this power of expediting or protracting might be of infinite importance to the intereſts of the candidates, but your Committee will only mention two, viz. Where freemen have been made by redemption or purchaſe, and want a few days to compleat the twelve months, before the expiration of which, they cannot legally vote; or, where the right being in inhabitants houſeholders, or perſons paying ſcot and lot, ſome of them have not finiſhed the

ſix months reſidence, which the ſtatute requires as neceſſary to conſtitute an inhabitant.

When the day of election is fixed, *the returning officer is to appoint the poll clerks;* and the encreaſing or reducing the number of theſe, tends, in populous places, materially to expedite or retard the proceedings.

During the time of the election *the returning officer has the peace of the borough under his care*, and he may, at his diſcretion, create as many aſſiſtant conſtables as he may chooſe to think there is occaſion for;—theſe he will ſcarcely ſelect but from among thoſe who are in the ſame intereſt with himſelf.

But though he is thus empowered to provide for the preſervation of the peace, *the exiſtence of tumults and riots gives him a freſh opportunity of exerciſing his diſcretion.* By the 25 of Geo. III. it is enacted, that the poll muſt be kept open a certain number of hours in every day, "unleſs prevented by *any unavoidable accident.*" What is "an unavoidable accident," the returning officer is to decide; ſo that the whole operation of this proviſion of the law is left to his diſcretion. Particularly it reſts with him to determine, in the event of any *diſturbance*, whether it require an adjournment, and for *how long*.

But the great ſource from which a returning officer derives his conſequence and power, remains yet to be ſtated.

Hitherto your Committee have only ſpoken of duties which require no more than honeſt intentions to diſcharge properly:—they now come to conſider a truſt repoſed in him, for the due execution of which not only integrity, but peculiar diſcernment, penetration, and legal ability are abſolutely neceſſary.

A trial of the merits of an election before a Committee of the Houſe of Commons, is no more than *a repetition of the trial had before the returning officer* at the time of the poll. The points in diſcuſſion are the ſame; and the regulations thought neceſſary by Parliament for the inveſtigation of them upon the appeal, abundantly prove the intricacies in which the preſent ſyſtem of election laws are involved, and the ſtrong temptations to which the judgments of thoſe who are to decide, are virtually acknowledged to be expoſed.

To enquire into the merits of a petition complaining of an undue return of a member to ſerve in Parliament, when the queſtion is brought before the Houſe of Commons, it is thought neceſſary to ſecure impartiality, by chooſing a jury of thirteen by ballot; and to prevent the inconvenience that would ariſe if the lot ſhould fall on thirteen gentleman, unaccuſtomed to judicial proceedings, the Parties are permitted to nominate two more, who are added to them.

With ſuch caution is it thought neceſſary to conſtitute the Court, which, *upon the appeal*, is to enquire into the diſputed rights of voting, the qualifications, and diſqualifications of electors, and the various legal diſtinctions which ariſe from the operation of ſo extenſive a body of ſtatutes as thoſe relative to elections. The Committee ſo appointed have alſo full power to ſend for perſons, papers, and records, and to examine witneſſes upon oath.

At the Election itſelf the ſame truſt is committed to *one man*, who, though originally only a *miniſterial* officer, is veſted with equal authority to decide, but left to form that deciſion from the mere aſſertions of partial witneſſes not ſpeaking upon oath, and to oppoſe whoſe teſtimony, whatever he may ſuſpect, or either party demand, he can neither compel the attendance of perſons, nor the production of written evidence. All diſputable points of law which ariſe in the courſe of an Election, are ſubmitted to his *ſole* determination. *He* is to ſettle what ſhall or ſhall not be received as evidence, and arbitrarily to decide upon all doubtful votes which he may admit, or reject at his pleaſure. In a word, to his *uncontrouled judgment*, and to the *purity of his motives* in the exerciſe of it, the Houſe of Commons looks for the legal and true Repreſentative of the People.

The magnitude of the truſt, and the corrupt practices of which thoſe who poſſeſs it are to be ſuſpected, your Committee apprehend they have ſufficiently ſhewn, by ſtating *the jealouſy with which the Legiſlature delegates it to its own Members*. Why they ſhould diſplay ſo much leſs anxiety for wiſdom and integrity in the taking of the original poll than in its reviſion, your Committee do not preſume to gueſs, but a due attention to facts compels them to aſſert, that it cannot be from any reaſonable prepoſſeſſion in favour of Returning officers, becauſe your Committee muſt report them to be, very frequently *notoriouſly illiterate and needy*; very generally *avowed partizans of one of the candidates*; and almoſt always *appointed by intrigue or cabal*. Of the numerous petitions preſented to Parliament, there is ſcarcely one but what contains ſome charge againſt them either for *partiality* or *corruption*; and of the various mal-practices in which they have been detected, and of the multitude of offences of which they have been convicted, let the Journals of Parliament, from the firſt volume to the laſt, bear teſtimony.

YOUR COMMITTEE come now to ſtate *the nature of the remedy provided by the Legiſlature, in all caſes where the propriety of the Return is diſputed*.

The laſt General Election took place in the month of June 1790, and the Petitions preſented to Parliamant, complaining of undue Returns, were in Number 39; of theſe *twenty-one* were decided *within twelve months*; *nine* more *within two years*, and the opening of the year 1793 has ſeen the Houſe of Commons with difficnlty procure Committees to proceed upon the complaints of the remainder. It is to be obſerved, that the perſons returned, *exerciſe*, till the Petitions againſt them are brought to a hearing, *every privilege of a Member of Parliament*; and it has happened, that men have ſat in the Houſe, and voted during the two laſt Seſſions or the preſent Parliament, without, as it has afterwards appeared, having had any pretenſions whatever, beyond the good wiſhes of a pliant Returning Officer. The event of the Petitions, now depending, may poſſibly ſhew, that ſome even ſit three Seſſions (or *one half of the uſual duration of a Parliament's exiſtence*) with as little right on their ſide.

Such is the manner in which the Houſe of Commons poſtpones the deciſion of the Appeals brought before it. When at laſt the ſuitors have

have the fortune to procure a hearing, the length to which the proceedings are protracted exceeds all bounds. The Court can only ſpare time to ſit five hours in each day, and the number of days which may be conſumed in the trial of a Petition, will appear from the following account of the duration of ſome of thoſe which have been tried within theſe laſt ten years. †

		Committee appointed	Report made	Trial laſted Day
1784	Downton	17th January	19th July	32
1784	Ivelcheſter	29th June	21ſt July	22
1785	Bedford county	18th March	19th May	62
1785	Cricklade	14th February	4th April	49
1785	Downton	17th February	9th March	20
1785	Penryn	24th February	18th March	22
1785	Southwark	3d March	4th April	32
1786	Seaford	22d February	13th March	19
1787	Norwich	15th February	9th March	22
1789	Colcheſter	26th February	6th April	39
1789	Weſtminſter	3d April	6th July	95
1791	Carliſle	25th February	14th March	17
1791	Exeter	4th March	23d March	19
1791	Ludgerſhall	29th March	14th April	17
1791	Oakhampton	3d February	28th Feb.	25
1791	Fowey	8th February	7th March	27
1791	Steyning	15th February	7th March	20
1791	Downton	7th April	17th May	40
1791	Newcaſtle (Staffordſh.)	23d February	21ſt March	26
1792	Horſham	16th February	10th March	22
1792	Steyning	13th March	5th April	23
1792	Seaford	28th February	19th March	19
1792	Cirenceſter	5th March	10th May	66

YOUR COMMITTEE having thus ſhewn the *delay* and *inconvenience* to which they who apply for redreſs to the Houſe of Commons, are expoſed, have only to ſtate the *expence* to which they are likewiſe ſubjected, in order that a thorough knowledge may be had of the ſituation in which Petitioners are placed, who appeal from the deciſion of the returning officer.

Your Committee might lay before you numerous accounts, and thoſe perfectly authentic, of the enormous ſums expended by parties having petitions tried before the Houſe of Commons, but, always preferring to quote thoſe facts which are eaſieſt to be proved, they will only avail themſelves of the particular caſes where the charges have been recorded.

By the 28th *Geo.* III. where petitions are reported to have been frivolous and vexatious, *taxed coſts are allowed;* by referring therefore to thoſe petitions which have been ſo reported, your Committee are enabled, from authority, to give a general idea of the expence attending an appeal to the Houſe of Commons. They only beg it may be re-

† See the Votes of the Houſe of Commons.

membered, that the amounts ſtated underneath, are the *taxed*, and not the *real* coſts, which they underſtand to have been nearly double, and that they are the charges defrayed by only *one* of the parties.

The hearing of the petition for *Barnſtaple* laſted 8 days— taxed coſts	-	-	-	£ 514
1791	Weſtminſter	2 days	-	396
1791	Colcheſter	2 days	-	460
1791	Lauder	2 days	-	240
1791	Orkney	3 days	-	198
1791	Bodmyn	1 day	-	

YOUR COMMITTEE will ſum up all that has been ſaid reſpecting the mode of conducting elections, and the operations of Mr. Grenville's acts, by a plain narrative of the progreſs of two recent conteſts. The *firſt* at *Seaford*, where the number of voters is leſs than 90; the *ſecond* at *Weſtminſter*, the moſt populous borough in England.

At *Seaford*, the object of one of the candidates was to protract the election till twenty-ſix of his friends had completed the ſix months reſidence, which the law requires to conſtitute inhabitancy, and of which term, when the diſſolution of Parliament took place in June 1790, *ſeventeen days* were wanting.

The means adopted on the occaſion to obviate this difficulty, were attended with ſucceſs. The returning officer was cautious, and patient. Exerciſing his diſcretionary power to the utmoſt extent, he did not bring on the election till the *eighth day*‡ after receiving the precept, and the remaining *nine days* were conſumed in purſuing the methods mentioned in the former part of this Report. The qualifications and diſqualifications of the voters were canvaſſed at full length, and their principles and purity examined by the teſt of every oath which the law has at any period invented againſt Popery, bribery, &c.—The Counſel argued, the returning officer doubted, the candidate harangued, and the electors ſwore, till the neceſſary number of days were paſt, which qualified the twenty-ſix new inhabitants to vote. The poll then cloſed, and the candidate, whoſe intereſt it had been to procraſtinate, carried his point, merely by manœuvre and delay.

The loſing candidate preſented a petition to the Houſe of Commons againſt this return, but could not obtain a hearing *till the 28th of February*, 1792. A committee was then appointed, which after ſitting *nineteen* days, reported to the Houſe on the 19th of March, that the member returned was not duly elected, and that his opponent was entitled to the ſeat—*a ſeat of which he had been illegally deprived for near two years, becauſe the returning officer required nine days to poll leſs than ninety votes, and the recovery of which was attended with an expence perfectly incompatible with every idea of free repreſentation.*

The *ſecond* caſe to which your Committee beg your attention, relates to *Weſtminſter*. The

‡ In 1784 the returning officer for Seaford choſe to be as much expeditious in his proceedings as in 1790 he was too dilatory. He brought on the election on the fourth; the conſequence of which was, that it was determined to have been void, and the parties were expoſed to the expence of a ſecond conteſt.

The election came on the 18th of July, 1788, and the poll continued 14 days. A petition was presented to Parliament, complaining of an undue return, and it came to a hearing on the 3d of April, 1789.

The Committee continued to sit till the 18th of June, when ethy came to the following most extraordinary resolutions.

Resolved, "That from the progress which the Committee have hitherto been enabled to make, since the commencement of their proceedings, as well as from an attentive consideration of the different circumstances relating to the cause, a final decision of the business before them cannot take place in the course of the present session, and that *not improbably the whole of the present Parliament may be consumed in a tedious and expensive litigation.*

Resolved, "That from the necessary length of the proceeding, and the approach of a General Election. which must occur not later than Spring 1791, (NEARLY TWO YEARS DISTANT) *the prosecution of the cause on the part of the petitioners promises to be fruitless, as far as it respects the representation of Westminster in the present Parliament.*

Resolved, That it be recommended to the petitioners to withdraw their petition under the special circumstances of the case."

The business, however, proceeded till the 6th of July, when *the petitioner was obliged to relinquish his claim, after in vain attempting to bring it to a final issue in the course of a hearing which lasted above three months.*

In all this long period, the only act of the Committee which bore even the appearance of a judicial decision, was a resolution respecting *the right of voting in Westminster.* Against this determination an appeal was presented to the House of Commons on behalf of the electors, in July 1789, and, though regularly renewed in every session, has not yet been favoured with a hearing, notwithstanding it has been before the House *above three years.* The consequence is, that *at this hour the right of voting in Westminster remains unsettled*, and should another contest take place, it would again expose the candidates to a tedious, expensive, and probably fruitless litigation.

YOUR COMMITTEE conceive they cannot better conclude this part of their enquiry than by a short statement of the general results which arise from it;

They therefore report, that it appears,

That, the number of representatives assigned to the different counties is grossly disproportioned to their comparative extent, population, and trade.

That, a majority of what are called the representatives of the Commons are returned by the 170th part of the male subjects of England paying taxes, even supposing these only to amount to two millions.

That, the partial distribution of the elective franchise, which subdivides this 170th part into 155 other parts, commits the choice of representatives to select bodies of men of such limited numbers, as renders them an easy prey to the artful, or a ready purchase to the wealthy.

That

That the right of voting is regulated by no uniform or rational principle reſpecting either property or condition. That from the caprice with which it has been varied, and the obſcurity in which it has become involved by time and contradictory deciſions, it is a ſource of infinite confuſion, litigation, and expence.

That the manner in which elections are conducted is diſgraceful to the name of free election. That it is inconvenient to the elector, and ruinous to the candidate. That it is a ſcourge to the honeſt and peaceable, and a harveſt to the diſſolute and corrupt.

That the power given to returning officers, too often, (except in counties) men of extreme ignorance, or known depravity, added to the delay of the Houſe of Commons in attending to the petitions for redreſs, frequently deprives the electors of their true repreſentative for years.

That the preſent ſyſtem of election laws which profeſſes to qualify a man for Parliament who poſſeſſes three hundred pounds a year, is only calculated to inſult the People with the ſhew of an independent choice, becauſe, by its operation, it diſables, all who have not incomes of at leaſt as many thouſands, from becoming candidates.

Laſtly, *That* the length of the duration of Parliaments, ſubjected to the will of the Crown, tends to make the repreſentative independent of the conſtituent, to render him ſubmiſſive to the commands of thoſe in power, and to diſturb "that happy union and good agreement between "the King and People," which, by our anceſtors at the Revolution, was ſo conſtitutionally aſſerted to ariſe "from frequent and new elections."

Of private patronage, and the influence poſſeſſed by Peers and Commoners.

YOUR COMMITTEE having explained the nature of the repreſentation conſidered with reſpect to its ſeparate and diſtinct parts, having ſhewn the defective and inconvenient materials of which it is compoſed, and pointed out the difficulties thereby thrown in the way of the fair elector and the independent candidate, come now to inveſtigate the operation of the whole, and to examine and report what is the general reſult as it affects the ſecurity of the Conſtitution, and the liberties of the country at large.

Your Committee are aware, that, in ſpeaking upon this head, they are about to enter on a ſubject which they might eaſily diſcover many inducements to paſs over in ſilence; but they feel that they have undertaken a public duty of an importance which precludes all idea of liſtening to any private conſiderations, and they eagerly embrace the opportunity of proving their ſincerity in the cauſe of the people, by a full, an explicit, and an impartial ſtatement.

To this line of conduct, even if they were not urged by principle, they would be compelled by motives of regard for the character of that Society to which they have the honour to belong. Such unprecedented pains have been taken to diſcredit the intentions with which you have profeſſed to act; ſuch high and unexpected authorities have been exer-

ted

ted to hold you up rather as the enemies than the Friends of the People, that your Committee conceive it their duty, to enable you to join iſſue with your calumniators, and, prepared with every evidence the cauſe requires, to appeal to the ſober judgment of the country.

YOUR Committee report, that the groſs defects and abuſes which, under the preceding heads, they have proved to exiſt in the preſent mode of repreſentation, have eſtabliſhed A SYSTEM OF PRIVATE PATRONAGE, which renders the condition of the Houſe of Commons *practically* as follows.

71	Peers and the Treaſury nominate -	90	
	Procure the return of - -	77	
	Patronge of 71 Peers and the Treaſury		167
91	Commoners nominate - -	82	
	Procure the return of - -	57	
	Patronage of 91 Commoners -		139
162	return - - -		306 out of 513 Members.

This ſtatement your Committee are aware will create conſiderable ſurprize; and as many may be taught to doubt its accuracy, they have thought it neceſſary to explain the nature of their calculation, and on what it is founded, in ſuch a manner, as that every man may be enabled to correct their errors, if they have erred, or to convince himſelf of the truth of what they have aſſerted.

With this view they have given the names of the different Patrons, and are happy that thoſe names are of too reſpectable a deſcription to afford the moſt remote ſuſpicion that any invidious motives have produced the mention of them.

The Patronage your Committee have divided under two heads.—*Nomination*, and *Influence*; and attributed it to diſtinct perſons, under the deſcriptions of *Peers* and *Commoners*.

With reſpect to this firſt diviſion, your Committee deſire to have it underſtood that,

By a *nomination*, they would deſcribe that *abſolute authority in a borough which enables the patron to command the return.* The number of places ſet down in this claſs might, your Committee have every reaſon to believe, be with ſtrict propriety conſiderably encreaſed, but from a wiſh to avoid all cavil, they have confined themſelves to ſuch boroughs as are under undoubted controul. Theſe, in general, are the private property of the patrons, or have the right of voting veſted in a ſmall corporate body, the majority of whom are his immediate dependents.

By *Influence*, your Committee would deſcribe *that degree of weight acquired in a particular county, city, or borough, which accuſtoms the electors on all vacancies to expect the recommendation of a candidate by the patron, and induces them, either from fear, from private intereſt, or from incapacity to oppoſe, becauſe he is ſo recommended, to adopt him.*

This

This diſtinction between Nominations and influence has appeared neceſſary for ſeveral reaſons. It is true that the effect of both is nearly alike, but ſtill it might ſeem improper to ſpeak of them in the ſame terms. The repreſentation of *Old Sarum* and of *Cheſter* could not, for inſtance, without much offence, be claſſed under the ſame head, and there are many other places, where, though the will of the patron is conſtantly *complied with*, it would perhaps ſeem too harſh a phraſe to ſay that he can *command*.

On the ſubject of the *counties*, which are ſtated to be under influence, your Committee are eſpecially anxious to ſay a word or two in explanation.

THEY would be ſorry that, owing to any miſapprehenſion, it ſhould be conceived that in every inſtance where they uſe the word *influence*, an injurious ſenſe ſhould be annexed to it. Property, they well know, will always have a conſiderable operation, nor is it meant to inſinuate that, becauſe there is ſaid to be influence, corruption muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to exiſt†. Where fortune enables, and diſpoſition induces a man to diſcharge the friendly offices of neighbourhood and connection with zeal and liberality, your Committee would be deeply concerned to be ſuſpected of a wiſh to arraign, or in any manner decry the extenſive and honorable attachment which ſuch a line of conduct muſt, and ought to procure.

Property may however obtain a degree of weight beyond what is natural to it. It may be enabled to excite fear as well as to procure reſpect; and without purchaſing a majority, or controuling its dependents, it may acquire ſuch power as to overcome and bear down all oppoſition.

Preciſely this ſpecies of power is thrown into the hands of the wealthy, by the ſyſtem on which at this day elections are conducted. It confines the choice of the electors within the ranks of opulence, becauſe, though it cannot make riches the ſole object of their affection and confidence, it can and does throw obſtacles almoſt inſurmountable in the way of every man who is not rich, and thereby ſecures to a ſelect few, the capability of becoming candidates.

This monopoly has not however been obtained without many and vigorous ſtruggles, but it has unfortunately happened that reſiſtance has but ſerved to tighten the cord. Conteſts have been found to be attended with ſuch extravagance, party heat, tumult, expence, and litigation, and the dreadful effects of theſe have ſpread ſo wide and endured ſo long, that, on the proſpect of a vacancy, more conſideration is now beſtowed to contrive the means of *preſerving the peace of the county*, (the phraſe uſed on theſe occaſions) than to ſecure its freedom and independence.

The meaſures adopted for this preſervation of the peace are different in different counties; in all, however, they are founded *on ſome ſort of* COMPROMISE, *by which a ſacrifice is made of at leaſt one half of the Freeholder's Franchiſe.*

† Our readers are deſired to recollect, that theſe are not the ſentiments of the ſocieties, by which this publication is reprinted.

County

County Elections may be ſaid to be, in general, conteſted, either *by two political Parties*, or *by two great families*, or *by a great family and the gentry*. In all theſe caſes the expedient uſually had recourſe to, prevent the conſequences of a ſtruggle, is *for each if the contending intereſts to name one member*.

Where political Parties alone are concerned, it cannot indeed be ſaid that ſuch an arrangement comes under the head of influence or patronage, becauſe in truth its only operation is entirely to ſtrike out of the repreſentation the county compromiſed; but where *the conceſſions are made from one great family to another*, or *from the gentry to a great family*, as is often avowedly the caſe, can there be a queſtion as to the ſituation in which at leaſt one of the members returned by every county, ſo circumſtanced, is placed? *Does he not owe his ſeat to a Patron?* and is it in the power of the maſs of the freeholders to break the combinations thus formed againſt them, unleſs they ſhall have the very peculiar good fortune to find a man, who, with principles ſufficiently independent to ſet him above the fear of offending thoſe in power, is ready to incur the fatigues, and able to defray the enormous expence of a conteſt, conducted upon the groſs ſyſtem of abuſe which has been explained by your Committee in the former part of their Report?

Much of what has here been ſaid reſpecting the cauſes which contribute to bring the repreſentation of counties within the reach of a patron's influence, applies to populous cities, and great towns: but in thoſe there is alſo the additional influence to be ſtated which is obtained through the medium of the returning officer. From the ſtricteſt enquiries your Committee have been able to make, they are convinced that, in nine corporate towns out of ten, *one member, at leaſt, is returned by the ſelect body*. Of the fact the curious may eaſily inform themſelves; but let it be remembered that, if it ſhould be aſcertained, the ſole queſtion will then be, who influences the ſelect body?

It would have been an endleſs taſk to have diſcuſſed all the information your Committee have received reſpecting the probability of alterations in the ſtate of the patronage at the next election, and as the whole of theſe ſuggeſtions are built on ſpeculation, and whether well grounded or otherwiſe, *only change the name of the patron*, they have thought it beſt to confine themſelves to what appears to have been the ſtate of the various intereſts at the *laſt* general election.

With reſpect to the *influence of the Treaſury*, your Committee apprehend that it will occaſion much ſurprize to find it apparently ſo limited, but it muſt be obſerved, that this is not a ſpecies of influence ſubject to any direct proof, and therefore your Committee have, wherever they could, avoided the mention of it, by inſerting the name of the oſtenſible patron, even where he openly holds a place during pleaſure under government.

The ſources whence the influence of the Treaſury is derived in the five towns mentioned in the table, your Committee apprehend to be too notorious to require any explanation.

With regard to the diſtinction reſpecting *Peers* and *Commoners*, your Committee beg to be underſtood as having made it, becauſe they have thought

thought in their duty to point out the extent of an interference, which the Houſe of Commons has uniformly declared to be unconſtitutional.

At the commencement of every ſeſſion, the following reſolutions, are entered on the journals.

Reſolved. "That no peer of this realm hath any right to give his vote "in the election of any member to ſerve in Parliament."

Reſolved. "That it is a high infringement upon the liberties and "privileges of the Commons of Great Britain, for any lord of Parliament, or any Lord Lieutenant of any county, to concern themſelves "in the elections of members to ſerve for the Commons in Parliament."

Your Committee have been the more diſpoſed to take notice of theſe reſolutions, becauſe the power of the Houſe of Lords, in matters of election, has been prodigiouſly encreaſed within the laſt ten years *by the creation of* NINE PEERS *who return, by nomination and influence, no leſs than* TWENTY-FOUR MEMBERS *to the Houſe of Commons.*—If, therefore, the interference of the Lords in the elections of the Commons be, as the latter uniformly declare, a *high infringement* of their liberties and privileges, your Committee muſt report thoſe liberties and privileges to have been of late ſubject to the moſt alarming and frequent attacks.

Your Committee have thus endeavoured to explain the nature of the diſtinctions they have made reſpecting the patronage of the different places. Subject to theſe obſervations they proceed to lay before you the following table, and will only add the moſt ſolemn aſſurance, that it is to the beſt of their knowledge, a true and unexaggerated ſtatement. If in any inſtance they have erred by attributing a patronage to any nobleman or gentleman of which he is not poſſeſſed, let it be conſidered whether, in correcting the miſtake, you can do more than *eraſe one name for the purpoſe of inſerting another*, which, as no party ſuggeſtions ought here to have weight, cannot make any ſubſtantial difference. The object of your Committee is not to ſhew that this or that particular ſet of men have obtained the command of the repreſentation, but to prove that the *People have loſt it:* If, therefore, they ſhall even have committed ſuch an error as to have put down any place in the table which is not only uninfluenced by the patron there named, but alſo uninfluenced by any ſingle patron whatever, let it be examined, whether ſuch place do not come under the the deſcription of being *compromiſed by political parties;* if ſo, it is equally taken away from the ſervice of the People, though it cannot be ſaid to be given to the controul of an individual.

PATRONAGE

PATRONAGE OF PEERS.

NAMES OF PATRONS	NOMINATIONS	INFLUENCE.		Total Members returned by Peers.
E. of Lonſdale *nominates*	1 for Appleby 2 - Cockermouth 2 - Haſlemere	influence —	2 for Weſtmoreland	7
Ld. Mount Edgecumbe	1 - Boſſiney 2 - Leſtwithiel 2 - Plympton	—	1 - Fowey - -	6
Lord Eliott -	2 - Liſkeard 2 - Grampound 2 - St. Germain's	—		6
Duke of Newcaſtle -	2 - Boroughbridge 2 - Aldborough (Yorſh.)	—	1 - Newark - 1 - Eaſt Retford	6
Marqs. of Buckingham	2 - Buckingham 2 - St. Mawes	—	1 - Buckinghamſh. 1 - Ayleſbury -	6
Lord Ayleſbury -	2 - Marlborough 2 - Great Bedwin	—		4
Duke Northumberland	2 - Launceſton 2 - Neport (Corwl.	—		4
Duke of Marlborough	2 - Woodſtock 1 - Heyteſbury	—	1 - Oxfordſhire 1 - Oxford	5
Earl Fitzwilliam -	2 - Malton 1 - Higham Ferrers	—	2 - Peterborough	5
Marquis of Lanſdowne	2 - Calne -	—	2 - Wycombe -	4
Lord Sydney -	1 - Whitchurch	—	2 - Ludgerſhall	3
Duke of Devonſhire	2 - Knareſborough	—	1 - Derbyſhire 1 - Derby -	4
Duke of Bedford -	2 - Taviſtock	—	1 - Bedfordſhire 1 - Oakhampton	4
Marquis of Stafford -	- - - -	—	1 - Staffordſhire 1 - Litchfield	2
Lord Hertford -	2 - Orford	—		2
Lord Abingdon -	2 - Weſtbury			2
Duke of Norfolk - -	- - - -	—	1 - Arundel	1
Duke of Rutland -	1 - Bramber -	—	1 - Grantham 1 - Scarbro' 1 - Newark	4
Duke of Richmond -	- - - - -	—	1 - Chicheſter 1 - Seaford	2
Lord Radnor -	2 - Downton -		1 - New Sarum	3
Duke of eaufort -	- - -	—	1 - Monmouthſh 1 - Monmouth 1 - Glouceſterſh.	3
Lord Sandwich -	- - - -	—	2 - Huntingdon 1 - Ditto ſhire	3
Number of Peers Patrons 22 nom. 52		influence 34	Total -	—

AMES OF PATRONS	NOMINATIONS	INFLUENCE.	Total Members returned by Peers.
Brought forward 22	52	Brought forward 34	86
Marquis of Bath	*nomn.* 2 - Weobly -	*influences*	2
Lord Egremont -	2 - Midhurſt -	—	2
Lord Weſtmoreland -	2 - Lyme Regis -	—	2
Lord Cornwallis -	2 - Eye -	—	2
Duke of Grafton -	- - -	— 1 - Bury 1 - Thetford	2
Duke of Dorſet -	2 - Grinſtead -	—	2
Duke of Bridgewater -	2 - Brackley -	—	2
Lord Beverley - -	2 - Beeralſton -	—	2
Lord Camelford - -	2 - Old Sarum -	—	2
Lord Foley - -	2 - Droitwich -	— 1 - Worceſterſh.	3
Lord Bute - -	1 - Boſſiney -	— 1 - Cardiff	2
Lord Portſmouth -	- - -	— 1 - Andover	1
Lord Orford - -	1 - Caſtle Riſing	—	1
Lord Malmeſbury -	1 - Chriſtchurch	—	1
Lord Hardwicke -	1 - Ryegate -	— 1 - Cambridgſhire	2
Lord Somers - -	1 - Ryegate -	—	1
Lord Townſhend - -	1 - Tamworth -	—	1
Lord Harrowby - -	2 - Tiverton -	—	2
Lord Darlington - -	1 - Winchelſea -	—	1
Lord Bulkeley - -	1 - Beaumaris -	—	1
Lord Powis - -	1 - Montgomery	—	1
Duke of Bolton -	- -	— 1 - Totneſs	1
Lord Spencer -	- - -	— 1 - Oakhampton. 1 - St. Alban's	2
Lord Falmouth -	- 2 - Truro -	—	2
Lord Thanet - -	1 - Appleby		1
Lord Guildford - -	1 - Banbury		1
Lord Camden -	- - -	— 1 - Bath	1
Lord Poulett -	- - -	— 2 - Bridgewater	2
Lord Groſvenor -	- -	— 2 - Cheſter	2
Lord Bathurſt -	- -	— 1 - Cirenceſter	1
Lord Shafteſbury -	- -	— 1 - Dorcheſter	1
Lord Berkeley -	- -	— 1 - Glouceſterſhire	1
Lord Brownlow -	- -	— 1 - Grantham	1
Lord Pembroke -	2 - Wilton -	—	2
Lord Oxford -	- - -	— 1 - Radnorſhire 1 - New Radnor	2
Duke of Manchester	- - -	— 1 - Huntingdonſh.	1
Lord Pelham -	- - -	— 1 - Lewes	1
Duke of Portland	- - -	— 1 - Nottinghamſh.	1
Lord Uxbridge -	1 - Milbourne Port	1 - Angleſea 1 - Carnarvon	3
Lord Exeter -	-	— 2 - Stamford	2
Lord Warwick -	- -	— 2 - Warwick	2
Lord Petre -	- -	— 1 - Thetford	1

NAMES OF PATRONS.	NOMINATIONS.	INFLUENCE.	Total Members returned by Peers.
Brought forward 64	88	Brought forward 64	152
Lord Clarendon *nominates* -		*influences* — 1 - Wootton Baſſett	1
Lord Bolingbroke -	-	- - — 1 - Wootton Baſſett	1
Lord Carliſle - -	-	- - — 2 - Morpeth	2
Lord Onſlow - -	-	- - — 1 - Guildford	1
Lord Walpole - -	-	- - — 1 - Lynn	1
Lord Grimſton -	-	- - — 1 - St. Albans	1
Duke of Leeds -	-	- - — 1 - Penryn	1
No. of Peers. Patns. 71	nom 88	influence 72	Total 160
The Treaſury *nominate*	2 for Queenborough	- - -	2
Ditto -	-	- *influence* 1 for Dover -	1
Ditto -	-	- - 1 - Rocheſter	1
Ditto -	-	- - 1 - Plymouth	1
Ditto -	-	- - 2 for Windſor	2
71 Peers and the Treaſury nomin. 90		influence 77	Total 167

PATRONAGE OF COMMONERS.

NAMES OF PATRONS.	NOMINATIONS.	INFLUENCE.	
Wm. Drake, Eſq. *nominates*	2 for Agmondeſham	*influences*	2
Lord Clive -	2 for Biſhops Caſtle -	1 for Ludlow	3
Rev. Mr. Holmes -	2 for Newport (Hants), 1 for Yarmouth ditto		3
Sir J. St. Aubyn, Bart.	1 for Helſtone -	- -	1
—— Rogers, Eſq.	1 for Helſtone -	- - -	1
W. Pulteney, Eſq. -	- - - - -	4 for Weymouth, &c., 1 for Shrewſbery	5
R. Barwell, Eſq. -	2 for Tregony, 1 for Winchelſea	- -	3
P. C. Creſpigny, Eſq.	2 for Aldborough (Suffolk)	- -	2
—— Treſuſis, Eſq.	2 for Callington, 1 for Aſhburton	- -	3
Sir H. Bridgman, Bart.		1 for Wenlock, 1 for Wigan	2
J. Buller, Eſq. -	2 for Saltaſh, 2 for Weſt Looe	-	4
—— Buller Eſq. -	2 for Eaſt Looe	- -	2
Sir Francis Buller, Bart.	- -	1 for Totneſs	1
Sir R. Clayton, Bart.	2 for Blechingly	- - - -	2
Sir T. Dundas, Bart.	2 for Richmond	- -	2
Sir E. Deering, Bart.	2 for Romney	- - -	2
Sir T. Frankland, Bart.	2 for Thirſke	- - -	2
Sir H. Burrard, Bart.	2 for Lyminton	- -	2
Sir H. Calthorpe, Bart.	1 for Bramber	1 for Hindon	2
Commoners Patrons 19	34	10	Total 44

NAMES

NAMES OF PATRONS	NOMINATIONS	INFLUENCE.	Total Memb. returned by Commoners
Brought forward 19	34	10	44
Sir F. Baſſett, Bart.	- *influences*	1 for St. Michael's 1 for Penryn	2
Sir J. Honeywood, Bart	*nom.* 2 for Steyning -	- -	2
Sir F. Sykes, Bart.	- -	2 for Wallingford	2
Sir J. Vanneck, Bart, -	1 for Dunwich -	- -	1
Sir F. Barrington, Bart.	1 for Newtown (Hants)	- -	1
Sir R. Worſley, Bart. -	1 for Newtown (Hants)	- -	1
Sir C. Hawkins, Bart.	- - -	1 for St. Michael's	1
Sir R. Palke, Bart.	1 for Aſhburton	- -	1
Sir G. Yonge, Bart	- -	1 for Honiton	1
Sir C. Davers, Bart. -	- - -	1 for Bury	1
Sir S. Fludyer, Bart.	- -	1 for Chippenham	1
Sir W. W. Wynne, Bart.	- -	1 for Denbighſhire	1
Lord Weſtcote -	1 for Bewdley	- -	1
Lord Middleton -	1 for Whitchurch	- -	1
Sir C. Gould Morgan	- -	1 for Brecon -	1
W. Joliffe, Eſq. -	2 for Petersfield	- -	2
J. Robinſon, Eſq.	2 for Harwich	- -	2
—— Wilkins, Eſq.	2 for Malmeſbury	- -	2
R. Troward, Eſq.	2 for Ilcheſter	- -	2
W. Praed, Eſq. -	- - -	2 for St. Ives	2
T. P. Leigh, Eſq.	2 for Newtown (Lancaſh.)	-	2
W. C. Meddlycott, Eſq.	1 for Milbourne Port	- -	1
J. Calcraft, Eſq.	2 for Wareham	- -	2
J. B. Church, Eſq.	2 for Wendover	- -	2
Lady Irwin -	2 for Horſham	- -	2
Mrs. Allanſon -	2 for Rippon	- -	2
Sir Jonathan Phillips	2 for Camelford	- -	2
Thomas Liſter, Eſq. -	1 for Clitheroe	- -	1
P. A. Curzon, Eſq. -	1 for Clitheroe	- -	1
John Mortlock, Eſq. -	- -	2 for Cambridge Tn.	2
C. Anderſon Pelham, Eſq.	-	2 for Grimſby	2
J. F. Luttrell, Eſq.		2 for Minehead	2
B. Barne, Eſq.	1 for Dunwich		1
J. Bond, Eſq.	1 for Corfe Caſtle		1
H. Bankes, Eſq.	1 for Corfe Caſtle		1
E. Lalcelles, Eſq.	1 for Northallerton		1
H. Pierce, Eſq.	1 for Northallerton		1
R. Ladbroke, Eſq.	1 for Gatton		1
W. Currie, Eſq.	1 for Gatton		1
W. P. Aſhe A'Court, Eſq.	1 for Heyteſbury		1
B. Howard, Eſq.	1 for Caſtle Riſing		1
George Hunt, Eſq.	1 for Bodmin		1
Lord Milford		1 for Haverfordweſt	1
C. Foreſter, Eſq.		1 for Wenlock	1
J. C. Jervoiſe, Eſq.	1 for Yarmouth (Hants)		1
C. Sturt, Eſq.		1 for Bridport	1
G. Roſe, Eſq.	1 for Chriſtchurch		1
Com. 66	nominate 77	21	108

NAMES

NAMES OF PATRONS	NOMINATIONS	INFLUENCE	Total Mem returned by Commoners.
Brought fordward 66	77	31	108
W. Evelyn, Esq. *nominates*		*influences* 1 for Hythe	1
St. C. F. Radcliffe, Esq.		1 for Hythe	1
T. W. Coke, Esq.		1 for Derby	1
T. Anson, Esq.		1 for Litchfield	1
W. Lee Antonie, Esq.		1 for Marlow,	1
T. Williams, Esq.		1 for Marlow	1
R. Middleton, Esq		1 for Denbigh	1
Philip Rashleigh, Esq.		1 for Fowey	1
C. Tudway, Esq.		1 for Wells	1
J. Dawkins, Esq.		1 for Chippenham	1
H. Penton, Esq.		1 for Winchester.	1
R. Peel, Esq.	1 for Tamworth		1
James Sutton Esq:		2 for Devizes	2
—— Whitaker, Esq.		2 for Shaftesbury	2
Sir P. Burrell, Bart.		1 for Boston	1
Jos. Iremonger, Esq.		1 for Andover	1
W. Beckford, Esq.		1 for Hindon	1
Sir J. Carter		2 for Portsmouth	2
E. Bastard, Esq.		2 for Dartmouth	2
Edward Mildward, Esq.	2 for Hastings		2
Thomas Lamb, Esq.	2 for Rye		2
P. Stephens, Esq.		1 for Sandwich	1
Lord Mulgrave		1 for Scarbro'	1
R. Gamon, Esq.		1 for Winchester	1
Right Hon. T. Harley		1 for Leominster	1
Commoners 91	nominate 82	57 Total	139

In the preceding table, your Committee have in some places stated only *one member* to be returned by influence. The following is the list of those places, exclusive of the counties represented in a similar manner.

Aylesbury,	Lewes,	Guildford,	Retford,
Chichester,	Arundel,	Dorchester,	Bridport,
Lynn,	Plymouth,	Seaford,	Shrewsbury,
Wells,	Boston,	Bath,	Honiton,
Cirencester,	Ludlow,	Leominster,	Rochester
Dover,	Oxford,	Sandwich,	Salisbury,
Bodmin			

Your Committee not being able to procure any authentic information respecting the disposition of the *second vote* in these places, have forborn to make any estimate of it. In a few instances (most probably in all the counties) there is reason to believe that it is exercised with a proper spirit of independence; but in general it can hardly be supposed that those who obsequiously surrender one half of their privileges will be very scrupulous in the disposal of what remains.

The

The following boroughs, viz. *Stockbridge*, *Heydon*, and *Barnſtaple*, though under the management of no particular patron, muſt not however be paſſed over in ſilence. The number of voters in them all does not amount to 500; and though your Committee do not think it prudent to ſtate the ſort of influence which they are informed has moſt weight in theſe places, they conceive it right to mention their names ſeparately, that others may determine how far the members they contribute, might with propriety be added to the liſt of thoſe, with whoſe return to parliament the unbiaſſed ſuffrages of the people have little or no concern.

It remains only to ſay a few words on the number of places *compromiſed by political parties*.

It has been before obſerved, that theſe arrangements *are made frequent by the intolerable expence attending conteſts*, to avoid which an expedient is adopted, which, in its operation, effectually deſtroys every principle of repreſentation. Your Committee here ſpeak of thoſe *compromiſes* which take place *betweeu political parties*, and which are very diſtinct from thoſe *between two contending patrons*, or *a patron and the electors*. In the latter caſes, the compromiſe relates to *men*, in the former to *meaſures*. It is not impoſſible but that thoſe who are *returned by the influence of a patron*, may, (though not the organ through which the electors might wiſh to ſpeak) in delivering their own, deliver the ſentiments of the electors, but thoſe who are *returned by a compromiſe of parties*, muſt, to be faithful to their ſeparate truſts, counteract the political conſequence of each other, and deprive the borough that ſends them to Parliament, of all parliamentary weight. When two gentlemen honeſtly and conſcientiouſly profeſs principles diametrically oppoſite, (for your Committee are perſuaded that each of the members of the places in queſtion is honourably attached to his party, by the conviction that ſuch attachment is beneficial to his country) can it be ſaid that the Borough which is repreſented by both of them, is repreſented for the purpoſes of more than a turnpike, or a paving bill. Will it be contended that ſuch a choice can ariſe from any other cauſe *than a dread of the conſequences that would attend any attempt to aſcertain the real ſentiments of the majority of the electors?* Or can it be believed that men *voluntarily* make a ſacrifice of one half of their franchiſe, and that too in ſuch a way as to render the half they retain of no value?

Let it not be thought that your Committee wiſh to caſt any imputation on the electors who ſubmit to theſe compromiſes. They do not merit any, for, in truth, they adopt them on compulſion; neither, while ſuch a majority is returned in the manner that has been ſhewn, is it of any material conſequence how or by whom the minortiy is elected? It has been aſked why *Mancheſter*, *Birmingham*, and other populous places, do not petition for leave to ſend Members to Parliament, and their ſilence has, by the enemies to Reform, been conſtrued into an argument in favour of the preſent ſtate of the repreſentation; but ſurely theſe *compromiſes* afford at once a ſatisfactory anſwer, when it is ſeen that the

mode

mode of conducting elections is such, as makes *Newcastle, Bristol,* &c. more anxious to wave than to exercise their privileges.

The following is a list of the places compromised by political parties—Newcastle upon Tyne—Bristol—Cheshire—Essex—York—Westminster—Leicester— Maldon— Lancashire—Glouceſter — Preston—Cumberland—Herefordshire. and Sussex.

It only remains for your Committee to give the grand result of their whole enquiries, and which, if the facts on which they have relied shall be found to have been well grounded, will appear in the following.

GENERAL STATEMENT.

71	Peers, and the Treasury, return	167	
91	Commoners return	139	
162	Peers and Commoners, with the Treasury, return		306
100	Electors at Poole return	2	
102	—— Stockbridge	2	
190	—— Heydon	2	
250	—— Barnstaple	2	
200	—— Wigan	†1	
54	—— Salisbury	1	
36	—— Bodmyn	1	
160	—— Plymouth	1	
200	—— Boston	1	
83	—— Seaford	1	
32	—— Bath	1	
112	—— E. Retford	1	
180	—— Bridport	1	
120	—— Guildford	1	
240	—— Lewes	1	
190	—— Arundel	1	
200	—— Dorchester	1	
	17 Boroughs, not containing, on an average, 150 voters each, return		21
2611	Persons, return to serve in Parliament,	Members	327

To these 327 add 28, who are returned by *compromises*, and it will appear, in what manner such a number of the Members of the House of Commons is elected, as constitutes a MAJORITY of no less than ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVEN of the Representatives of England and Wales.

† Where only one member is stated to be returned, it is to be understood that the other has been accounted for under the head of Patronage.

Since the foregoing Report was Printed, a variety of changes have, no doubt taken place; probably without any effect on the Repreſentation, worthy of notice; except the creation of Peers on the 13th Auguſt, 1794, which, with their nominations and influence, were as under:

Lord Clive *nominates* 2 for Biſhop's Caſtle, and *influences* 1 for Ludlow				3
Lord Mulgrave - - - - -		— 1 -	Scarborough	1
Lord Bradford - - - -		1 -	Wenlock	2
		1 -	Wigan	
Lord Dundas - 2 -	Richmond - - - -			2
Lord Curzon - 1 -	Clitheroe - - - -			1
Lord Yarborough - -		— 2 -	Grimſby	2
nominate 5		*influence* 6	Total	11